DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 399 337 UD 031 302

AUTHOR LeClair, Mary C.; Hansen, James C.
TITLE A Comparison of Homeless and Non-Homeless Adolescents.
PUB DATE Aug 95
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (103rd, New York, NY, August 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Attitudes; *Attribution Theory; Causal Models; Comparative Analysis; *Homeless People; Multivariate Analysis; Racial Differences; *Student Attitudes; Urban Schools; *Urban Youth

ABSTRACT

The goal of this study was to extend what is currently understood regarding attitudes toward the homeless population. The study focused on how homeless and nonhomeless adolescents attribute the causes of homelessness. Grounded in attribution theory, the study hypothesized that nonhomeless adolescents would ascribe causality to dispositional or personal factors within a homeless person. Homeless adolescents, on the other hand, would causally attribute a person's state of homelessness to environmental conditions outside the person's immediate control. The samples consisted of two groups of adolescents, 61 homeless and 80 nonhomeless, ranging in age from 12 to 20 years. No differences were found at the multivariate level for the two groups along four dependent measures, two structural and two individual. Significance at the univariate level was found by group for both individual factors. A significant group and race interaction was also found on one structural factor. The literature was reviewed and further research questions were proposed. Appendixes contain the research questionnaire and a list of the dependent measures. (Contains 4 tables and 42 references.) (Author/SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A Comparison of Homeless and Non-Homeless Adolescents

Mary C. LeClair, MA and James C. Hansen, Ph.D.

State University of New York at Buffalo

ED 399 337

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary C. LeClair

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Presented as a poster session at the 1995 APA Annual Convention under Division 27

All inquiries about this paper should be directed to: Mary C. LeClair, MA 409 Baldy Hall, Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology, SUNY-at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260

UD031302

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The goal of this study was to extend what is currently understood regarding attitudes toward the homeless population. More specifically, the study focused on how homeless and non-homeless adolescents attribute the causes of homelessness. Grounded in attribution theory, it was hypothesized that non-homeless adolescents would ascribe causality to dispositional or personal factors within a homeless person. Homeless adolescents, on the other hand, would causally attribute a person's state of homelessness to environmental conditions outside of the person's immediate control. The study consisted of two groups of adolescents, homeless and non-homeless, ranging in age from twelve to twenty years of age. No differences were found at the multivariate level for the two groups along four dependent measures, two structural and two individual. Significance at the univariate level was found by group for both individual factors. A significant group and race interaction was also found on one structural factor. The literature was reviewed and further research questions proposed.

A Comparison of Homeless and Non-Homeless Adolescents

Introduction

A systematic study of homelessness in the United States dates to before the turn of this century (Lee, Link, and Toro, 1991). Only in recent years, however, has homelessness gained national attention. Although a great deal of research exists on the homeless population (Shinn, Burke, & Bedford, 1990), much of it is descriptive in nature. As Lee, Link, & Toro (1991) contend, studying homeless people in order to describe the population is not enough. Although descriptive knowledge (such as who the homeless are , where they are from, and what circumstances often precede the state of homelessness) is an important first step toward initiating systematic efforts to alleviate the problem of homelessness, it must be used to advance the understanding of its causes (Elliott & Krivo, 1991).

Several authors believe that a precursor to understanding the causes of homelessness is examining how society attributes causality to the process of becoming homeless and to the homeless themselves (Elliott & Krivo, 1991; Gibson; 1991; Lee , Link, & Toro, 1991; and Toro & McDonnel, 1992). An awareness of non-homeless persons' perceptions of the homeless person's plight is an essential component often neglected in the study of homelessness. Knowledge of society's attitudes towards people who are homeless and how they became homeless is essential, for successful policy implementation aimed at easing the rise in the numbers of homeless relies on public support and is affected by public opinion (Toro & McDonnel, 1992; Lee et al., 1991).

Several theoretical perspectives for explanations of homelessness have dominated the literature. Lee, Lewis, & Jones (1992) discuss the dominant ideology perspective which examines the underpinnings of people's explanations for social inequality. This view posits that the public has individualistic beliefs about the causes of both success and failure. That is to say, a person is responsible for actions which place him or her in a desirable or undesirable position in society. If homelessness is viewed as an unfavorable situation, this perspective blames an individual for becoming that way. People, therefore, who hold a more favorable position in society, such as

non-homeless persons, find this perspective more plausible than those in a disadvantaged state, such as homeless persons. Nonetheless, according to this theory, a person's success or failure is attributable to factors within that individual and not on factors impinging upon him or her from the outside. As a consequence, people believe a person's state of homelessness stems from individual deficits rather than situational determinants (Ross & Nisbett, 1991).

The dominant ideological perspective is similar to the actor and the observer phenomenon in attribution theory (Jones, Kanouse, Kelley, Nisbett, Valins, & Weiner, 1972; Roediger, Rushton, Capaldi, & Paris, 1984; and Ross & Nisbett, 1991) This perspective states that actors' perceptions of causes of behavior differ from those held by outside observers. The actor, an individual involved in a situation such as a homeless individual, emphasizes the role of the environment as causing the situation or behavior. The observer, an individual outside of the situation such as a non-homeless individual, on the other hand, emphasizes the role of conditions within the actor. Attribution theory states that actors attribute their actions to situational determinants whereas observers tend to attribute causality to stable personal traits within the actor (Jones et al., 1972; Roediger et al., 1984). Applying this to the issue of causal attribution of homelessness, a homeless person might view the cause of becoming homeless as factors outside of his control (situational). A non-homeless person, however, possibly would blame a person's state of homelessness on character traits of the homeless individual. Both attribution theory and the dominant ideological perspective separate individual factors and structural factors as predominant causes for behaviors or states (Jones et al., 1972; Lee et al., 1991; and Roediger et al., 1984).

This demarcation along structural versus individual causes of behavior has infiltrated the homeless literature as two broad explanations of homelessness. These two orientations are commonly referred to as the structural position and the individual (or individualistic) position (Blasi, 1990; Elliott et al, 1991; Lee et al, 1991; Lee et al, 1992; Lee, Jones, & Lewis, 1990; Stoner, 1984; Toro & McDonnel, 1992). Much of the preliminary thinking of causes of homelessness and attitudes towards the homeless can be delineated along these divergent lines of attribution.

The structural position, for example, regards homelessness as an outcome of external, macro-level forces over which people have little control (Lee et al, 1992). Structural factors commonly cited as the major causes of homelessness include: lack of low cost housing (Bassuk, 1984; Conger, 1988; Elliott & Krivo, 1991; Fabricant, 1988; Gore, 1990; Hagan, 1987; Lee et al., 1992; McChesney, 1990; Rossi & Wright, 1987; Stoner, 1984; Youssef et al., 1988; and Toro & McDonnel, 1992); increased unemployment rates (Conger, 1988; Elliott et al., 1991; Hagan, 1987; Stoner, 1984); lack of community mental health care facilities (Bachrach, 1984; Elliott et al., 1991; Elpers, 1987; Lee et al., 1992); and poor economic conditions (Bassuk, 1984; Conger, 1988; Elliott et al., 1991; Fabricant, 1988; and Rossi & Wright, 1987).

The individual position, on the other hand, emphasizes traits internal to the person. This position focuses on personal problems and relatively stable personality traits of a person which cause them to become homeless (Elliott et al., 1991; and Lee et al., 1992). Common individual causes attributed to homelessness are: mental illness (Elliott et al., 1991; Fabricant, 1988; Hagan, 1987; Lee et al., 1991; Lee et al., 1992; Toro & McDonnel, 1992); substance abuse (Elliott et al., 1991, Hunter et al., 1991; Lee et al., 1992, Toro & McDonnel, 1992), and a lack of talent or motivation (Bahr & Houts, 1971; Bassuk, 1984; Hunter et al., 1991; Lee et al., 1992)

In spite of the numerous studies conducted on the homeless population and the frequent allusions to perceived attitudes towards the homeless and causes of homelessness, few empirical studies have been conducted in the area of societal attitudes toward the precipitants of this phenomenon. Although a substantial portion of the literature discusses both structural and individual factors, little has tested a theory of perceived causality. In reviewing the literature, only four such studies have been conducted, all within the past five years [See Lee, Jones, and Lewis, 1990, Lee, Link, and Toro, 1991; and Toro and McDonnel, 1992].

As demonstrated above, homelessness is an expansive societal problem. Although the field of psychology has taken a greater interest in defining and describing the homeless population, only in the past decade has research gone beneath the topology to begin to examine the causes of the problem. Interwoven with the actual causal antecedents to homelessness is the phenomenon of

causal attribution of homelessness. Whatever the causes may be, what society perceives as, and attributes to, the causes of homelessness affects what policies and concrete measures are taken to begin solving the problem. This study wished to expand the empirical knowledge of societal attitudes toward the causes of homelessness and the population in general.

The little research conducted in this area has reported a trend in attribution by non-homeless adults of structural factors. No research to date has focused on younger peoples' perceptions of homelessness. The adolescents of today are policy makers of tomorrow. Understanding their perceptions will enable more effective policy implementation in the future. Nor has any research compared homeless with non-homeless persons in attitudes towards this issue. Based on the theories discussed, differences in attribution between these two groups would be expected. This study examined how homeless and non-homeless adolescents attribute causality to the homeless. The major hypothesis is that homeless adolescents attribute homelessness to situational factors whereas non-homeless adolescents identify more individual factors as the cause. Based in attribution theory, the actor would be a homeless youth whereas the housed youth would be the observer. A non-homeless adolescent observer would attribute the cause of a person's state of being homeless more to individual factors as opposed to situational ones. A homeless adolescent, however, would less likely blame a state of homelessness on the individual but would concentrate causality on situational factors (Jones et al., 1972; Roediger et al, 1984).

Method

Sampling

Subjects in this study consisted of adolescents from Western New York. They ranged in age from 12 years to 20 years of age (X=16.24) with a total N=141. Nineteen and 20 year olds were kept in the study for they were either attending high school or being served at an adolescent shelter. Sixty-seven (47.5%) were males and 74 (52.5%) were females. Of the total sample, 60 (42.6%) described themselves as Caucasian and 81 (57.4%) as Non-Caucasian. The latter group consisted of: 65 (46.1%) African Americans; 3 (2.1%) Native Americans; 3 (2.1%) Asian or

Pacific Islanders; 3 (2.1%) Latin Americans; and 7 (5.1%) as other. Due to the small numbers of minorities other than African Americans, all subjects that indicated a racial or ethnic background other than Caucasian were included in the Non-Caucasian group. (See Table 1)

Insert Table 1

Two groups were devised according to self-reported living status. The first group (the housed group. Note: non-homeless and housed will be used interchangeably throughout the text to diminish confusion between the homeless and non-homeless groups) consisted of adolescents living with parents, step-parents, or foster parents (N=80). This group had 29 (36.25%) Caucasians and 51 (63.75%) Non-Caucasians. The second group (the homeless group) consisted of adolescents who reported currently living in a shelter, having no place to live, or living by themselves while under the age of 18. This group had 31 (50.82%) Caucasians and 30 (49.18%) Non-Caucasians. The determination of group membership was based on self-report of housing status.

Data were collected by the primary researcher as well as permanent staff members in various community agencies in Western New York. Collection began in November, 1993 and continued through March, 1994.

Instrumentation

The primary scale was a 22 item questionnaire based on a 4 point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree (a score of 1) to Strongly Disagree (a score of 4). The scale originally consisted of 29 items, 27 of which were taken from an interview schedule by Toro and McDonnel (1992). The remaining two items were taken from a similar schedule by Lee, Lewis, and Jones (1992). The 29 items were used to form a measure of perceived causes of homelessness as delineated from the literature. It consisted of two levels, or dependent measures. The first pertained to structural factors as causes of homelessness. The second attributed individual factors to homelessness. Lower scores on each measure indicated more agreement with the causes of homelessness depicted

in the items comprising the dependent measure.

In order to establish some internal validity, the measure was constructed by the researchers and consequently unvalidated, the 29 items were given to doctoral students in Counseling Psychology and Educational Psychology with a description of the meaning of structural and individual factors. Using these explanations, they were instructed to place each question into one of the two categories, structural or individual. The researchers then examined the concordance of the raters. This procedure was done on three separate occasions. After each administration, questions were deleted if an agreement of 80% or less was reached. Questions with greater than 80% but less than 100% concordance were revised after each administration. The new or revised questions were then given for additional rating along with those established by previous concordance. The third rating yielded total agreement as to the categorization of structural and individual items. As a result, a final questionnaire of 22 items, eleven of which were categorized as structural and eleven of which were individual, was used in data collection (See Appendix I).

Procedures

Each adolescent was given a copy of an informed consent letter delineating the study before being given the questionnaire. The voluntary nature of the study was clearly defined. Upon agreement of participation, the subject signed a copy of the informed consent, which was kept by the examiner. Each subject was then given a copy of the letter to keep. Subjects then completed the 22 item questionnaire and a demographic sheet which asked for age, self-ascribed ethnic or racial background, place of residence (either living with parents, foster parents, in a shelter, or homeless), and lastly occupation of parents. The entire procedure took approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Upon completion of data collection, a principle components analysis with a two-way rotation was conducted to determine scoring method of the questionnaire. It was found that each proposed dependent measure actually consisted of two sub-factors. Consequently, four dependent variables were made: two structural and two individual. Structural Factor One (SF1) consisted of six items pertaining to cuts in federal assistance. Cronbach's alpha was determined as 0.533 for

SF1. Structural Factor Two (SF2) was comprised of five items, all of which suggest lack of community supports. SF2 yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.501. Individual Factor One (IF1) addressed more externalizing behaviors (such as violent or delinquent behavior and alcohol and drug use) by an individual through five items with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.668. Lastly, Individual Factor Two (IF2) focused on endogenous or personality characteristics (such as mental illness, laziness, or lack of motivation). It was derived from five items yielding a Cronbach's alpha of 0.423. This principal components analysis also revealed low correlation of item 1 with any of the dependent measure. Consequently, it was not incorporated into any of the dependent measures (See Appendix II).

Results

Data were analyzed by SPSS and Multivariance statistical computer programs. The predictor variables utilized were group (with two levels of housed and homeless) and race (also with two levels of Caucasian and Non-Caucasian). The four dependent measures were SF1, SF2, IF1, and IF2 as determined through the principle components analysis discussed above.

Cell means were calculated for all predictor variables by the dependent measures (See Table 2). Lower numbers indicate more agreement with items. Higher numbers indicate more disagreement with the items. Correlations between dependent measures show little evidence for collinearity between the measures. A negative correlation ($r= -0.064$) was found between IF2 and SF1 (See Table 3).

Insert Table 2 and Table 3

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to compare the two structural factors and the two individual factors with group (housed and homeless) and race (Caucasian and Non-Caucasian) with an interaction. No significance was found at the multivariate level. Examination at the univariate level shows significance in three areas. There was a difference between groups on IF1 (externalizing behavior) [$F(4,143)=4.2$, $p<.05$]. The homeless group

(X=11.44) agreed to a greater extent than the housed group (X=12.35) that factors such as alcohol and drug use and violent behavior lead to an individual becoming homeless. Differences between groups were also found on IF2 (internalizing behaviors) [F(4,134)=3.1, p<.10]. Similar to group differences on IF1, the homeless group (X=14.15) favorably endorsed more items on IF2 than did the housed sample (X=14.82). The homeless adolescents showed more agreement that certain personality traits such as mental illness, laziness, and lack of talent can cause a person to become homeless than do their housed peers. Lastly, an interaction between group membership and race on SF1 (cuts in federal assistance) was found [F(4,134)=3.4, p<.10]. Housed Non-Caucasians (X=12.28) and homeless Caucasians (X=12.71) agreed more than did housed Caucasians (X=13.28) and homeless Non-Caucasians (X=13.37) that cuts in federal assistance contributed people having no place to live (See Table 4).

Insert Table 4

Discussion

No significant differences were found at the multivariate level of analysis between the housed and the homeless samples in their perceived causes of homelessness. The two groups of adolescents, consequently, do not differ in their overall attitudes when examining structural and individual factors simultaneously. The two groups, therefore, do not differ on this mulitvariate level in their attribution of homelessness as predicted. Significant differences were found, however, at the univariate level between groups for both individual factors (IF1 and IF2). These univariate results suggest that homeless and non-homeless adolescents do not have the same attitudes towards homeless persons and the causes of homelessness when addressing only individual characteristics. A significant univariate interaction of group and race was also found on SF1 indicating that within the two groups racial differences in attitudes were evident.

Contrary to the main hypothesis that non-homeless youth would place more blame on the individual, this study revealed that homeless adolescents agree more than housed adolescents that

externalizing behaviors (such as violent or delinquent behavior and drug and alcohol problems) lead to peoples' homelessness. This significance was at the $p<.05$ level. Group differences may have been an artifact of unequal N's. Another explanation may be that the homeless youth in this study may experience more difficulties in relation to these individual factors than do the housed youth. An important follow-up study would compare these two groups on their attitudes towards the causes of homelessness as well as the level of experience, either by themselves or in their families and community, with the areas addressed in the items of IF1. The level of experience can then be controlled for and differences more clearly defined.

Also at the univariate level, significant group differences were found on IF2 (endogenous or personality elements)[$p<.10$]. This suggests that homeless youth perceive factors such as mental illness, lack of talent and motivation, and laziness as contributing to homelessness to a greater extent than their housed counterparts. As discussed above, a follow up study would control for these factors in order to more clearly delineate the reasons for these differences. As discussed by Meindl & Lerner (1984) and Wills (1981), these homeless adolescents may dissociate themselves from the homeless group. They may not view themselves as belonging to this group which is referred to as mentally ill, alcoholics, and drug abusers. They may endorse these items as a way of distancing and disaffiliating from a stigmatized group. By affiliating with the socially accepted group, homeless youths may be engaging in self-protective properties (Crocker & Major, 1989).

Analysis also showed a significant group and race interaction for SF1 (cuts in federal assistance)[$p<.10$]. Housed Non-Caucasians and homeless Caucasians thought that federal cuts contributed to the cause of homelessness more than did housed Caucasians and homeless Non-Caucasians. A speculatory explanation may be that housed Non-Caucasians and homeless Caucasians may have similar socioeconomic situations. It is unclear why these other two groups have similar views as to the extent of the impact of federal cuts in assistance on the etiology of homelessness. A methodological flaw in this was the lack of socioeconomic pairing between adolescents in the two groups. Some housed adolescents were pooled from inner city schools

while others were from suburban areas. Future research should try to match socioeconomic and educational background of the homeless and housed sample to further clarify these differences and the interaction effect.

This study has several additional problem areas which need to be addressed. A primary weakness rests in the low level of internal consistency of the measure being used. Further validation and revision of the questionnaire is essential prior to its use in future research. Also, the time that a person was homeless was not controlled for. Some adolescents in the homeless sample may have been homeless for a day while others may have been on the streets for a month or more. Those homeless for longer periods may have very different attributions than those recently on the street.

The continuance of research in the area of homelessness is essential. The number of people living on the streets continues to rise each year with more and more families and youth among them. Shelters and other short-term aid programs do not appear to be helping to reverse this trend. Consequently, alternative methods are necessary in dealing with the problem of homelessness. People's perceptions of the causes of homelessness greatly affect which policies are implemented. Adolescents are the legislators of the future as well as the reflection of the views of adult society. It is imperative that researchers examine the experiences, opinions, and troubles that adolescents experience for that is where many of the problems as well as the solutions begin. If the cycle of homelessness is to be broken, then society needs to understand the antecedents and the social situations which keep this phenomenon in existence. Such an awareness will stimulate policy formation and implementation which can then address the problem of homelessness rather than just assuage the symptoms through temporary services and shelter. Much research needs to be done in this area. The problem will only worsen before it gets better if the emotions and attitudes towards homelessness are not delineated and addressed.

EXTENDED REFERENCES

Bachrach, L. (1984). Deinstitutionalization and women. American Psychologist, 39(10), 1171-1177.

Bachrach, L. (1987). Research on services for the homeless mentally ill. Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 35 (9), 910-914.

Bahr, H. & Caplow, T. (1968). Homelessness, affiliation, and occupational mobility. Social Forces, 47 (1), 28-33.

Bahr, H. & Houts, K. (1971). Can you trust a homeless man? A comparison of official records and interview responses by bowery men. The Public Opinion Quarterly, 35(3), 374-382.

Bassuk, E. (1984). The homeless problem. Scientific America, 251(1), 40-45.

Blasi, G. (1990). Social policy and social science research on homelessness. Journal of Social Issues, 46 (4), 207-219.

Conger, J. (1988). Hostages to fortune. Youth, values, and the public interest. American Psychologist, 43 (3), 291-300.

Crocker, J. & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. Psychological Review, 96.

Elliott, M & Krivo, L. (1991). Structural determinants of homelessness in the United States. Social Problems, 38(1), 113-131.

Elpers, J. (1987). Are we legislating reinstitutionalization? Americal Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57(3), 441-447.

Fabricant, M. (1988). Beyond bed and board: Teaching about homelessness. Journal of Teaching Social Work, 2 (2), 113-130.

First, R. & Toomey, B. (1989). Homeless men and the work ethic. Social Service Review, 34 (2), 113-126.

Gibson, R. (1991). Broken brothers and breaking stereotypes. Public Welfare, Spring.

Gore, A. (1990). Public policy and the homeless. American Psychologist, 45 (8), 960-962.

Hagan, J. (1987). The heterogeneity of homelessness. Social Casework: The Journal of

Contemporary Social Work, 451-457.

Hopper, K. (1989). The ordeal of shelter: Continuities and discontinuities in the public response to homelessness. Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics and Public Policy, 4 (2), 301-323.

Hopper, K. (1991). Symptoms, survival, and the redefinition of public space: A feasibility study of homeless people at a metropolitan airport. Urban Anthropology, 20(2), 155-175.

Hunter, J., Getty, C., Kemsley, M., & Skelly, A. (1991). Barriers to providing health care to homeless persons: A survey of providers' perceptions. Health Values, 15 (5), 3-11.

Jones, E., Kanouse, D., Kelley, H., Nisbett, R., Valins, S., & Weiner, B. (1972). Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior. (New Jersey: General Learning Press).

Kaufman, N. (1984). Homelessness: A comprehensive policy approach. The Urban and Social Change Review, 17(1), 32-26.

Lee, B., Lewis, D., & Jones, S. (1992). Are the homeless to blame? A test of two theories. The Sociological Quarterly, 33(4), 535-552.

Lee, B., Link, B., & Toro, P. (1991). Images of the homeless: Public views and media messages. Housing Policy Debate, 2(3), 649-682.

Lee, B., Jones, S., & Lewis, D. (1990). Public beliefs about the causes of homelessness. Social Forces, 69(1), 253-265.

Levine, I. & Rog, D. (1990). Mental health services for homeless mentally ill persons. American Psychologist, 45(8), 963-968.

McChesney, K. (1990). Family homelessness: A systematic problem. Journal of Social Issues, 46(4), 191-205.

Meindl, J.R. & Lerner, M.J. (1985). Exacerbation of extreme responses to an outgroup. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 71-84.

Proch, K. & Taber, M. (1987). Helping the homeless. Public Welfare, Spring, 5-9.

Rivlin, L. (1986). A new look at the homeless. Social Policy, 3-11.

Roediger, H., Rushton, J., Capaldi, E., & Paris, S. (1984). Psychology. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company).

Ross, L. & Nisbett, R.E. (1991). The person and the situation: Perspectives of social psychology. New York: McGraw Hill.

Rossi, P. (1990). The old homeless and the new homelessness in historical perspective. American Psychologist, 45(8), 954-959.

Rossi, P. & Wright, J. (1987). The determinants of homelessness. Health Affairs, Spring, 19-32.

Shinn, M., Burke, P., & Bedford, S., (Eds.). Homelessness: Abstracts of the Psychological and Behavioral Literature 1967-1990. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Snow, D. & Anderson, L. (1987). Identity work among the homeless: The verbal construction and avowal of personal identities. American Journal of Sociology, 92(6), 1336-1371.

Snow, D., Baker, S., Anderson, L., & Martin, M. (1986). The myth of pervasive mental illness among the homeless. Social Problems, 33(5), 407-423.

Spencer, S. & Steele, C. (1992, August). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

Stoner, M. (1984). An analysis of public and private sector provisions for homeless people. The Urban and Social Change Review, 17(1), 3-8.

Taylor, S.E. & Brown, J.D. (1988). Illusion and well being. A social psychological perspective on mental health. Psychological Bulletin, 103, 193-210.

Toro, P. & McDonnel, D. (1992). Beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge about homelessness: A survey of the general public. American Journal of Community Psychology, 20(1), 53-62.

Wallace, S. (1968). The road to skid row. Social Problems, 16(1), 92-113.

Wills, T.A. (1981). Downward comparison principles in social psychology. Psychological Bulletin, 90, 245-271.

Youssef, F., Omokehinde, M., & Garland, I. (1988). The homeless and unhealthy: A review and analysis. Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 9, 317-324.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of the Total Sample

Variable	Levels	Frequency	Percent
Race			
	Caucasian	60	42.6%
	African Amer.	65	46.1%
	Native Amer.	3	2.1%
	Asian/Pac.Island.	3	2.1%
	Latin Amer.	3	2.1%
	Other	7	5.1%
	Total	N=141	100.0%
Group	Housed	80	56.7%
	Homeless	61	43.3%
	Total	N=141	100.0%

Table 2

Cell Means for Group and Race on the Four Dependent Measures SF1, SF2, IF1, and IF2

		SF1	SF2	IF1	IF2
Housed (n=80)		12.64	10.87	12.35	14.82
	Caucasian (n=29)	13.28	10.90	12.07	14.97
	Non-Caucasian (n=51)	12.28	10.86	12.51	14.75
Homeless (n=61)		13.03	10.89	11.44	14.15
	Caucasian (n=31	12.71	10.36	11.25	14.26
	Non-Caucasian (n=30)	13.37	11.43	11.63	14.03
Total Sample		12.81	10.88	11.96	14.53

Note: SF1=Structural Factor One/Cuts in Federal Assistance

SF2=Structural Factor Two/Lack of Community Supports

IF1=Individual Factor One/Externalizing Behaviors

IF2=Individual Factor Two/Endogenous or Personality Elements

Table 3

Correlations Between Dependent Measures

	SF1	SF2	IF1	IF2
SF1	1.00			
SF2	0.36	1.00		
IF1	0.08	0.24	1.00	
IF2	-0.06	0.09	0.44	1.00

Note: SF1=Structural Factor One/Cuts in Federal Assistance

SF2=Structural Factor Two/Lack of Community Supports

IF1=Individual Factor One/Externalizing Behaviors

IF2=Individual Factor Two/Endogenous or Personality Elements

Table 4

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)

Source	D.F.	Multivariate Likelihood ratio	F (D.F.)	Univariate	Ratios
Group	1	0.96	1.5	SF1=	0.8
			(4,134)	SF2=	0.0
				IF1=	4.2*
				IF2=	3.1#
Race	1	0.97	1.1	SF1=	0.3
			(4,134)	SF2=	1.5
				IF1=	0.8
				IF2=	0.3
Gro*Race	1	0.97	1.1	SF1=	3.4#
			(4,134)	SF2=	2.1
				IF1=	0.0
				IF2=	0.0
Error (Within Cells)	137	Mean	Squares=	SF1=	6.842
				SF2=	4.855
				IF1=	6.799
				IF2=	5.048

Notes:

# p<.10 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***P<.001

Appendix I: Research Questionnaire

Please answer each question the best that you can. Read the question first. Then circle the answer that you believe to be true. Only circle one response.

SA - stands for STRONGLY AGREE (or you agree with the question A LOT)

A - stands for AGREE (or you agree with the question A LITTLE BIT)

D - stands for DISAGREE (or you DO NOT agree with the question A LITTLE BIT)

SD - stands for STRONGLY DISAGREE (or you DO NOT agree with the question AT ALL)

(Circle one for each question)

SA	A	D	SD	1.	Some young people choose to leave their family to live on the street.
SA	A	D	SD	2.	The lack of mental health services contributes to the problem of homelessness.
SA	A	D	SD	3.	Mental illness is a major cause of homelessness.
SA	A	D	SD	4.	A low minimum wage causes homelessness.
SA	A	D	SD	5.	People who become homeless have little talent.
SA	A	D	SD	6.	Government cuts in low cost housing have contributed to the rise of homelessness.
SA	A	D	SD	7.	Many people are homeless because of alcohol problems.
SA	A	D	SD	8.	Homelessness is often due to social and economic circumstances people can not control.
SA	A	D	SD	9.	People are homeless because of their violent behavior.
SA	A	D	SD	10.	Abusive families cause some people to live on the street.
SA	A	D	SD	11.	Most homeless people have a mental illness.
SA	A	D	SD	12.	The lack of low cost housing contributes to homelessness.
SA	A	D	SD	13.	Drug use causes many people to be homeless.
SA	A	D	SD	14.	Lack of government job training programs contributes to homelessness.
SA	A	D	SD	15.	Many people remain homeless by choice.

SA	A	D	SD	16.	Many people are homeless because hospitals force them to leave.
SA	A	D	SD	17.	People are often homeless due to criminal or delinquent behavior.
SA	A	D	SD	18.	Cuts in Public Assistance have forced more people to live on the street.
SA	A	D	SD	19.	Many people are homeless because they do not have the willpower to stay away from drugs or alcohol.
SA	A	D	SD	20.	If there were more jobs, there would be fewer homeless people.
SA	A	D	SD	21.	Family problems cause some people to become homeless.
SA	A	D	SD	22.	If a homeless person wanted to work and was not so lazy, he or she would have a place to live.

Appendix II Dependent Measures Broken Down Into Individual Items

SF1 (Structural Factor One / Cuts in Federal Assistance)

Item 4 - A low minimum wage causes homelessness.
Item 6 - Government cuts in low cost housing have contributed to the rise of homelessness.
Item 12 - The lack of low cost housing contributes to homelessness.
Item 14 - Lack of government job training programs contributes to homelessness.
Item 18 - Cuts in Public Assistance have forced more eople to live on the street.
Item 20 - If there were more jobs, there would be fewer homeless people.

SF2 (Structural Factor Two/Lack of Community Supports)

Item 2 - The lack of mental health services contributes to the problem of homelessness.
Item 8 - Homelessness is often due to social and economic circumstances people cannot control.
Item 10 - Abusive families cause some people to live on the street.
Item 16 - Many people remain homeless by choice.
Item 21 - Family problems cause some people to become homeless.

IF1 (Individual Factor One/Externalizing Behaviors)

Item 7 - Many people are homeless because of alcohol problems.
Item 9 - People are homeless because of their violent behavior.
Item 13 - Drug use causes many people to be homeless.
Item 17 - People are often homeless due to criminal or delinquent behavior.
Item 19 - Many people are homeless because they do not have the willpower to stay away from drugs or alcohol.

IF2 (Individual Factor Two/Endogenous or Personality Elements)

Item 3 - Mental illness is a major cause of homelessness.
Item 5 - People who become homeless have little talent.
Item 11 - Most homeless people have a mental illness.
Item 15 - Many people remain homeless by choice.
Item 22 - If a homeless person wanted to work and was not so lazy, he or she would have a place to live.